

1 Marc P. Cook, Esq.  
2 Nevada Bar No. 004574  
COOK & KELESIS, LTD.  
3 517 S. 9th St.  
Las Vegas, NV 89101  
(702) 737-7702  
4 Fax: (702) 737-7712  
Email: law@bckltd.com  
5 [Additional counsel appearing on signature page]

6 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
7 and the alleged Class

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 **NEIGHBORHOOD NEUROPATHY**  
11 **CENTER OF RENO LLC,**  
individually and on behalf of all others  
similarly situated,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 **MEDRISK LLC**

15 Defendant.

Case No. 3:19-cv-00619-LRH-WGC

16 **JOINT PROPOSED DISCOVERY**  
**PLAN/SCHEDULING ORDER**

17 Plaintiff Neighborhood Neuropathy Center of Reno LLC (“Plaintiff”) and  
18 Defendant MedRisk LLC (“Defendant” or “MedRisk”) jointly submit this Rule  
19 26(f) Report pursuant to Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

20 **1. Statement of the Case**

21 Plaintiff’s Position: This putative class action challenges Defendant’s alleged  
22 violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, as amended by the Junk Fax  
23 Prevention Act of 2005, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.*, (“JFPA” or the “Act”). In short,  
24 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant sent it at least nine (9) facsimile messages between  
25 February and July 2019 in violation of the JFPA.

1                   Defendant's Position: Plaintiff's sole claim under the Telephone Consumer  
2 Protection Act, as amended by the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005, 47 U.S.C. §  
3 227 *et seq.*, ("JFPA" or the "Act") fails as a matter of law. Among other legal  
4 deficiencies in the claim, the faxes that form the basis for the claim were not  
5 "unsolicited advertisements," and thus, they cannot be violations of the JFPA.

6 **2. Subject Matter Jurisdiction**

7                   This case is an alleged class action brought under the Telephone  
8 Consumer Protection Act, as amended by the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005,  
9 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.*, ("JFPA" or the "Act"). As such, the Parties agree that  
10 the Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331. No issues exist as to  
11 personal jurisdiction or venue, and no parties remain to be served.

12 **3. Legal Issues**

13                   Plaintiff's Position:

14                   (i)    Whether Defendant's faxes violated the JFPA;  
15                   (ii)   Whether Defendant acted willfully;  
16                   (iii)   Whether one or more classes should be certified;  
17                   (iv)   The proper measure of damages.

18                   Defendant's Position:

19                   (i)    Whether Defendant's faxes were "unsolicited advertisements"  
20                   in violation of the JFPA?  
21                   (ii)   Whether Defendant's faxes were "informational" as  
22                   determined by the Federal Communications Commission?  
23                   (iii)   Whether Plaintiff has met its burden of establishing that class  
24                   treatment of this case is warranted.

25 **4. Service**

1 All parties have been served and there are no issues with service.

2 **5. Additional parties**

3 The parties do not expect to add any additional parties at this time.

4 **6. Contemplated motions**

5 Plaintiff anticipates filing a motion for class certification after an appropriate  
6 period of class discovery. Plaintiff also intends to move for summary judgment after  
7 a class has been certified. Plaintiff may need to file a motion to amend the pleadings  
8 as appropriate. Defendant may file one or more dispositive motions on or before the  
9 dispositive motion deadline.

10 **7. Arbitration**

11 The case is not suitable for reference to arbitration or to a Magistrate Judge  
12 for trial.

13 **8. Related Cases**

14 The parties are not aware of any related cases.

15 **9. Discovery**

16 *a. Extent, nature, and location of discovery*

17 **Plaintiff's Position:** Plaintiff believes that discovery should proceed  
18 with respect to both class certification and merits issues for a period of eight (8)  
19 months. The first six (6) months will be devoted to written and oral fact discovery.  
20 The final two (2) months of this period will be devoted to experts. At the close of this  
21 eight (8) month period the Plaintiff would file a motion for class certification.  
22 Following a ruling on class certification the Court would hold a subsequent case  
23 management conference and establish a schedule for the remainder of the case,  
24 including a period for any remaining merits-based discovery, and dates for summary  
25 judgment briefing, pre-trial conferences, and the trial.

26

27

28

**Defendant's Position:** Defendant believes that discovery is needed on all issues in Plaintiff's complaint and is expected to take approximately 180 days from December 2, 2019, the date Defendant filed its Answer to Plaintiff's complaint. Discovery should follow the normal course, including interrogatories, requests for production, requests for admission, and the taking of depositions at a location convenient for the applicable and necessary parties to each deposition. Defendant reserves the right to seek bifurcation of merits and class issues, if Defendant concludes that such bifurcation is appropriate.

*b. Suggested Changes to Discovery Limitations*

The Parties do not propose any changes to the discovery limitations imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

c. *Number of hours per deposition*

The Parties propose 8 hours per deposition.

## 10. Jury Trial

Plaintiff has made a proper jury trial demand. Defendant does not dispute Plaintiff's right to trial by jury but does not independently request a trial by jury.

## 11. Trial Length

The parties estimate that a trial in this case would take 3 days.

## 12. Settlement

The parties do not request Court assistance with settlement talks at this time. The parties reserve the right to request a judicial settlement conference after initial discovery has taken place.

## 13. Other Matters

There are no other matters that the Parties believe require Court attention at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

1  
2 Dated: January 16, 2020  
3  
4

**Neighborhood Neuropathy Center of Reno  
LLC, individually and on behalf of all others  
similarly situated,**

5 By: /s/ Patrick H. Peluso  
6 One of Plaintiff's Attorneys  
7  
8

9 Marc P. Cook, Esq.  
10 Nevada Bar No. 004574  
11 COOK & KELESIS, LTD.  
12 517 S. 9th St.  
13 Las Vegas, NV 89101  
14 (702) 737-7702  
Fax: (702) 737-7712  
Email: law@bckltd.com

15 Patrick H. Peluso\*  
16 ppeluso@woodrowpeluso.com  
17 Woodrow & Peluso, LLC  
18 3900 East Mexico Ave., Suite 300  
19 Denver, Colorado 80210  
20 Telephone: (720) 213-0676  
21 Facsimile: (303) 927-0809  
22  
23

24 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class  
25  
26 \* Pro Hac Vice  
27

28 **BALLARD SPAHR LLP**

19 By: /s/ Joel E. Tasca  
20 Joel E. Tasca, Esq.  
21 Nevada Bar No. 14124  
22 Emil S. Kim, Esq.  
23 Nevada Bar No. 14894  
1980 Festival Plaza Drive, Suite 900  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89135  
Tel: (702) 471-7000  
Fax: (702) 471-7070  
E-mail: tasca@ballardspahr.com  
E-mail: kime@ballardspahr.com

24 *Attorneys for Defendant Medrisk LLC*  
25  
26  
27